UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FEDERATED NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION,

No. C-11-1444 EMC

Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S EX **PARTE MOTION FOR REMAND**

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(Docket No. 4)

DON A. HARDING, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Federated National Mortgage Association ("FNMA") initiated this unlawful detainer action in state court. Defendants, proceeding pro se, removed the lawsuit to this Court on March 25, 2011. Currently pending before the Court is FNMA's ex parte motion to remand. The Court gave Defendants an opportunity to file a response to FNMA's motion. No response was filed. Having considered the papers that have been filed, as well as all other evidence of record, the Court hereby **GRANTS** FNMA's motion.

First, remand is appropriate because Defendants' removal was not timely. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), a notice of removal must be filed "within thirty days after the receipt by the defendant, through service or otherwise, of a copy of the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which such action or proceeding is based " 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b). In the instant case, Defendants were served with the summons and complaint on November 7, 2010. See Not. of Removal ¶ 2 (stating such). However, they did not remove the case until March 25, 2011 - i.e., almost five months later – well beyond the thirty-day window provided for by § 1446(b).

Second, remand is proper because this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. In their notice
of removal, Defendants assert that there is federal question jurisdiction because FNMA has violated
their right to due process. However, federal question jurisdiction depends on the contents of the
plaintiff's well-pleaded complaint; a case may not be removed to federal court based on a federal
defense, see ARCO Envtl. Remediation, L.L.C. v. Department of Health & Envtl. Quality of St. of
Mont., 213 F.3d 1108, 1113 (9th Cir. 2000), or a federal counterclaim. See Holmes Group, Inc. v.
Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc., 535 U.S. 826 (2002).

Accordingly, FNMA's motion to remand the case back to the state court from which it was removed is granted. The Clerk of the Court is instructed to enter judgment in accordance with this opinion and close the file in the case.

This order disposes of Docket No. 4.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 14, 2011

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	
8	FEDERATED NATIONAL MORTGAGE No. C-11-1444 EMC ASSOCIATION,
9	Plaintiff,
10	v. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
11	DON A. HARDING, et al.,
12 13	Defendants.
14	/
15	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the U.S. District Court, Northern
16	District of California. On the below date, I served a true and correct copy of the attached, by placing
17	said copy/copies in a postage-paid envelope addressed to the person(s) listed below, by depositing
18	said envelope in the U.S. Mail; or by placing said copy/copies into an inter-office delivery
19	receptacle located in the Office of the Clerk.
20	DON A. HARDING BRYAN R. BARNES
21	104 Spears Circle Richmond, CA 94801 104 Spears Circle Richmond, CA 94801
22	(510) 472-3881 (510) 472-3881
23	CYNTHIA HARDING 104 Spears Circle
24	Richmond, CA 94801 510) 472-3881
25	Dated: June 14, 2011 RICHARD W. WIEKING, CLERK
26	
27	By: /s/ Leni Doyle
28	Leni Doyle Deputy Clerk